REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending, of which claims 1-4, 13-16 and 21-24 are amended. No new matter has been presented.

Claims 1-4, 9, 11-16 and 18-24 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Chang, U.S. Patent No. 5,974,449. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, recites "attaching one of the re-formatted data having the decided format or the current format data having the decided format ***as an attachment to the e-mail***" (emphasis added). This feature is not taught or suggested by Chang.

Chang describe a system and method for a sender to send voice data via email to a recipient's telephone. As illustrated in figures 14-15 of Chang, a subscriber 1502 transmits voice mail data as an email attachment to a local server 1510, which then delivers the voice mail via a telephone call to an intended recipient. If the recipient is within the non-local area 1544, the local server 1510 transmits the email including the voice mail to the remote server 1536, which then delivers the voice mail to the recipient. Chang, Col. 17, lines 61-65. Otherwise, the local server 1510 extracts a digitized audio message from the attachment file, converts the audio message to a message having a voice mail format, and delivers the message by calling the intended recipient's destination telephone number. Chang, Col. 17, lines 46-54.

Therefore, Chang does not teach or suggest "attaching one of the re-formatted data having the decided format or the current format data having the decided format as an attachment to the e-mail," as recited in claim 1. Specifically, in contrast to the claimed invention, in Chang, the local server does not attach the voice mail data to the email that is being sent to the non-local recipient. Instead, Chang's subscriber attaches the voice mail to the email and the local server merely forwards that email to the non-local server.

The Office Action asserts that the claimed "attaching one of the re-formatted data having the decided format or the current format data having the decided format as an attachment to the e-mail," as recited in claim 1, corresponds to figures 7-8 and the description on column 11, lines

53-59 of Chang. Applicants respectfully disagree. Column 11, lines 53-59 of Chang disclose an embodiment of Chang's system for sending a fax to a recipient as an email attachment. Specifically, in this embodiment, the subscriber calls the local server 802 to send a fax to the local server 802, which then converts the fax to an email attachment and sends it to the intended recipient. Therefore, the "data" disclosed in this embodiment of Chang is different from the claimed "re-formatted data having the decided format or the current format data having the decided format," which the Office Action initially indicates as corresponding to Chang's "voice mail data." Consequently, Chang's disclosure of attachment of fax data to an email is completely irrelevant to claim 1. The local server does not perform any of the other recited features of claim 1, i.e., the claimed detecting step and the deciding step, with respect to fax data. Also, the fax data is not re-formatted based on a decided format, which in turn is based on the recipient's domain name. Chang does not suggest that its teachings of attaching a fax to an email can be similarly performed for voice mail data, such as, e.g., delivering voice mail data to the recipient as an email attachment. Accordingly, Chang fails to anticipate claim 1.

Furthermore, for similar reasons provided above, Chang fails to teach or suggest the claimed "***transmitting*** one of the re-formatted data having the decided format or the current format data having the decided format ***to the recipient's address as the attachment of the e-mail***," as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added). The only thing that Chang's system delivers to the recipient's address as an email attachment is fax data received from a subscriber. However, as described above, Chang does not perform any of the other recited features of claim 1 on the fax data and, therefore, Chang's fax data does not correspond to the claimed "one of the re-formatted data having the decided format or the current format data having the decided format," as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Chang fails to anticipate claim 1.

Claims 2-4, 13-16 and 21-24 recite similar features as claim 1 and are similarly allowable. Claims 9, 11-12 and 17-20 are allowable for being dependent from an allowable claim.

Claims 5-8 and 17 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Mai, U.S. Patent Application No. 2006/0242311. Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Dunnion, U.S. Patent Application No. 20002/0199119. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 5-8, 10 and 17 depend from an allowable claim. Neither Mai nor Dunnion overcome the deficiencies of Chang in teaching the features of the independent claims as discussed above. Thus, claims 5-8, 10 and 17 are allowable.

In view of the above, each of the claims in this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicants solicit early action in the form of a Notice of Allowance.

In the event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing Docket No. **325772033000**.

Dated: July 8, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Amir R. Rohani
Registration No. 61,782
Morrison & Foerster LLP
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 400
McLean, Virginia 22102
Telephone: 703.760.7757
Facsimile: (703) 760-7777